DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 269 764 CS 209 677

AUTHOR Norment, Nathaniel, Jr.
TITLE Contrastive Analyses of Organizational Structures and Cohesive Elements in English, Spanish (ESL) and Chinese (ESL) Students' Writing in Narrative and Expository Modes.
PUB DATE [82]
NOTE 33p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adults; *Cohesion (Written Composition); *English (Second Language); *Expository Writing; Higher Education; Language Usage; *Narration; *Sentence Structure; Spanish Speaking; Structural Analysis (Linguistics); *Writing Research; Writing Skills
IDENTIFIERS Chinese People; *Discourse Modes

ABSTRACT

A study examined the differences and similarities in the relationship between the organization of written English produced by native Chinese, English, and Spanish speaking adult college students when they wrote in the narrative and expository modes. Specifically, the study explored the kinds of cohesive devices that operated in the English text and determined the presence of these devices in the subjects' writing. Subjects, 30 Chinese, 30 English, and 30 Spanish speaking students, produced 180 writing samples. The City University of New York (CUNY) writing Assessment Test was used to select the subjects, while the Milic Logical Categories test and a cohesion scale were used to analyze their writing. Results indicated that (1) there was a distinct organizational structure in the writing samples of all students, (2) the organizational structure was produced across modes, (3) the frequency and percentage of use of cohesive devices were distinct for each language group, and (4) the three language groups produced more sentences and used more devices when writing in the narrative than in the expository mode. A three-page list of references and data tables are included. (FL)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED269764

# CONTRASTIVE ANALYSES OF ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURES AND COHESIVE ELEMENTS IN ENGLISH, SPANISH (ESL) AND CHINESE (ESL) STUDENTS' WRITING IN NARRATIVE AND EXPOSITORY MODES

Nathaniel Norment, Jr., Ph.D.
Director of Composition/Basic Writing
Department of English
City College
138th and Convent Avenue
New York, N.Y. 10031
(212) 690-5408

CS209677

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Nathaniel Norment, Jr.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ABSTRACT

This study was designed to investigate the differences and similarities in the relationship between the organization of written English produced by native Chinese, English and Spanish college adults when they wrote in the narrative and expository modes. This study explored the kinds of cohesive devices which have been identified as operating in English text; it determined the presence of these devices occurring in the written English text produced by the Chinese, English and Spanish subjects. The sample included Chinese (n = 30), English (n = 30), and Spanish (n = 30). The findings indicated that (1) there is a distinct organizational structure in the writing samples of Chinese, English and Spanish subjects, (2) the organizational structure is produced across modes, (3) the frequency and percentage of use of cohesive devices are distinct for each language groups and (4) the three language groups produced more sentences and used more cohesive devices when writing in the narrative mode than in the expository mode.

All data calculations were performed through the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) computer program. The SPSS "Frequencies" subroutine was used to obtain frequency distributions and correlation matrices. To complete the statistical analyses of the data: 13 two-way analyses of variance were performed, one for each of the eight scales generated by the Milic measure and one for each of the five scales from the Cohesive measure. Each ANOVA in this group was a 3 x 2 ANOVA in which the independent variables were native languages. The native language variable was a between-subjects variable, and the mode of discourse a within-subjects variable.

INTRODUCTION

During the past decade, the writing abilities of students have been the focus of language research (Hayes & Flower, 1981; Moffett, 1976; Mosenthal & Na, 1975; NAEP, 1975; Shaughnessy, 1977). Since clear writing is considered an indication of clarity of thought (Britton, Burgess, Martin, McLeod, & Rosen, 1975), written language samples can provide writing instructors with data from which to draw inferences about students' writing abilities. Shaughnessy (1977) stated that the academic audience, the least submissive of audiences, expects the writer to make "new" or arguable statements and to develop a case for them, meeting his audience's criteria of academic discourse.

Students at the high school and college levels are expected to write well-developed and coherent prose. The basic problems of teaching writing are compounded by the fact that the population to be taught has changed in today's urban high schools and colleges. Not only are there English-speaking students who have difficulty expressing themselves in writing, but also there is an increasing number of non-native students who have difficulty in expressing themselves in the written forms of the English language (CUNY, 1978, 1982; FForum, 1979).

The culture-based nature of rhetoric (Cook-Gumperz & Gumperz, 1981; Hymes, 1981; Kaplan, 1966, 1967, 1972) suggests that there are different organizational patterns and structures for different languages. More importantly, rhetorical forms are culture specific and without universal forms across cultures (Kaplan, 1966). The mere fact that a speaker/writer of one language exists in a

different linguistic environment suggests a basis for contrastive analysis. Kaplan even suggests that rhetorical interference can be observed in student writing when the rhetorical systems of two cultural linguistic environments are different. Thus, comparative and contrastive analyses are valuable linguistic tools for uncovering sources of difference in learning a second language. Despite the current interest in cross-language learning there has been very little research in the stylistic similarity between written English and other languages. The written language performance, especially of English as a second language students who are designated as less competent in producing written English, need to be investigated more. Since there may be different ways of organizing information in different language-cultural groups, we need to investigate what these ways are and how these differ from native English language production.

Many students who write poorly are perceived as being unaware that writing has a definite structure and that certain structures are used for different kinds of information. In appraising foreign students, the same academic audience assumes that students who can write an adequate essay in their native language can also write a comparably organized essay in a second language. Kaplan (1966, 1976) stated that this assumption is pervasive throughout American colleges and universities in recent years. He writes:

> Foreign students who have mastered syntactic structures have still demonstrated inability to compose adequate themes, term papers, theses, and dissertations. Instructors have written on foreign-student papers such

> comments as "The material is all here, but it seems somehow out of focus," or: "Lacks organization," or: "Lacks cohesion." And these comments are essentially accurate (Kaplan, 1976, p. 4).

Perhaps this perception is based on the fact that the structure the student has used is dissonant with the ones expected of him, but consonant with his own linguistic/cultural background. Kaplan (1966) hypothesized that there are differences in the organizational structure of rhetorical modes in English, Arabic, Chinese, Spanish, and French, such that the written compositions produced by speakers of any of these languages will be influenced by the linguistic background of the writer. Kaplan (1972) wrote that each language contains linguistic units--e.g., paragraphs or discourse blocs--which order information uniquely and that part of the learning of a particular language involves the "mastering of its logical system" (p. 4).

We need to explore whether we are asking non-native speakers to perform in a second language at a capacity greater than or different from the way in which they can express themselves in their own language. More detailed linguistic descriptions of written language samples of students are required to adequately determine the various linguistic structures characteristic of different languages. Writing, the written production of language, is a complex cultural linguistic process (Kaplan, 1972; Shuy, 1981; Smith, 1982). Learning to write in a second language is a more complex process than learning to write in one's native language (Kaplan, 1972; Smith, 1982).

One can conclude from this that for second-language students to accurately write discourse, they must be able to attend to the

cohesive relations that bind it together. In addition, they should be able to use various types of relations that exist between these elements which may occur in a particular language. Further, it has been demonstrated (Lieber, 1979; Witte & Faigley, 1981) that cohesion as a text-forming device increases the readability of text by making what is being stated relate to what has already been established in text (Halliday & Hasan, 1976). In analyzing students' written composition, it is important to determine first whether students' writing contains some means of connecting the ideas they wish to convey. Second, it would be helpful to know whether these same cohesive elements are present and/or operate in similar ways when students write in English as a second language (Lieber, 1979; Anderson, 1980; Johns, 1979). Halliday and Hasan (1976) stated that were it not for cohesion, a reader/listener could not interpret a discourse.

Statement of the Problem

In the present study, the relationship between language background and rhetoric style was investigated. The present investigation sought to examine the degree of similarity in the writing of native speakers of Chinese, English and Spanish to produce the two rhetorical modes--narration and exposition--in English, and to examine whether organizational differences exist between other language groups and English writers in producing the two discourse types.

The purpose of this study was to analyze the organization of written English of Chinese, English and Spanish speaking subjects cast

in two rhetorical modes. This study also explored the kinds of cohesive elements which have been identified as operating in English texts and to determine the presence of these elements in English written by non-native speakers of English. The independent variables in this study were: (1) the native language of each subject (Chinese, English and Spanish). (2) English-as-a-second language of each Chinese and Spanish subject; and (3) the rhetorical modes of narration and exposition. The dependent variables of the study were: (1) the Milic logical categories and (2) the Halliday and Hasan cohesive elements. The statistical procedures employed examined the independent variable of language background (Chinese, English and Spanish) as it interacted with the organization of paragraphs and presence of the various cohesive elements in each language group and in each rhetorical mode.

## METHOD

### Subject

The present study involved students enrolled at a senior college at the City University of New York. The population of subjects for the study included students required to register in a remedial Basic Writing (BW) class or in an English as a Second Language (ESL) class at the college. The sample population included Chinese subjects from Hong Kong, Taiwan, Southeast Asia, and Latin America. The Spanish subjects in the study included individuals from Chile, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, and Puerto Rico. The English subjects in this sample were graduates from the New York City public and parochial high schools. The English language subjects are native speakers of

English. For this study, the language background of the population was defined as English, Chinese, and Spanish regardless of the specific cultural environment in which they are reared. The researcher randomly selected subjects from three language groups--Chinese, English, and Spanish. The sample, Chinese (n = 30), English (n = 30), and Spanish (n = 30), was drawn from the target population of (approximately 3,000 students enrolled in BW or ESL courses) students at the College. Each language group included 30 students--five subjects selected for each of the six rating levels of the CUNY Writing Assessment Test (CWAT).

INSTRUMENTATION

The three instrumentalities used to analyze the data employed in the study were: (a) the CUNY Writing Assessment Test was used to select the sample populations; (b) the Milic logical categories was employed to identify organizational patterns in the subjects' writing samples; and (c) the cohesion scale was used to determine the occurrence of cohesive elements in the written texts.

The CUNY Writing Assessment Test (CWAT) is a six-category analysis of students' writing skills. Each of the six levels has several criteria used to place students in the Basic Writing or English as a second language program at the colleges. The Milic Logical Categories show the relationship between one sentence and the next. The categories identify the sequential arrangement and relationship of sentences in a composition. The eight categories are defined by Milic (1969): initial, additive, adversative, alternative, explanatory, illustrative, illative, and causal. The Cohesion Scale

was used to identify the cohesive elements appearing in the data. Halliday and Hasan (1976) defined cohesion as a part of the system of a language. The concept of cohesion is semantic; it refers to relations of meaning that exist within text. They outlined five discretely different elements: reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction and lexical.

DATA COLLECTION

Materials

The materials used in this study were the 180 writing samples produced by the three language groups, and the three instruments used to analyze the data. The researcher developed a set of topics used to collect the data. The topics were designed based on the universal content of each from a student's perspective--i.e.,

(1) Narrative topic.

You have just met someone you would like to become your friend and you want to tell that person something about yourself. What would be the most memorable childhood event that happened to you that you would want to share with this person (how old were you, what happened, how did you feel)?

(2) Expository topic.

Explain to a high school student the application and registration procedures required for admission into CCNY.

The writing samples, based on responses to the topic questions were collected over a period of four weeks. The students were requested during their regularly scheduled classes (50 minutes) to write on the assigned topics. Students were not asked to write a specific number of words.

## PROCEDURE

To accomplish the purposes of this study, two analyses of the data were completed. The first analysis determined the differences in the occurrence of logical arrangement and relationship of sentences in paragraphs. The second analysis determined the predominance of specific aspects of cohesion within and across language groups.

### Statistical Analysis

All data calculations were performed through the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) computer program. The SPSS "Frequencies" subroutine was used to obtain frequency distributions and correlation matrices. The following procedures were employed to complete the statistical analyses of the data: 13 two-way analyses of variance were performed, one for each of the eight scales generated by the Milic measure and one for each of the five scales from the Cohesion measure. Each ANOVA in this group was a 3 x 2 ANOVA in which the independent variables were native languages. The native language variable was a between-subjects variable, and the mode of discourse a within-subjects variable. These analyses of variance provided F statistics for the significance of native language group, mode of discourse, and the interaction between these factors.

Reliability coefficients from the raters were established. The results of the computations in which correlations range from .92 to .96 for the CUNY Writing Assessment Test, .87 to .94 for Milic Logical Categories, and .85 to .92 for cohesion devices. Their combined scores ranged from 0.85 to 0.96 with a median of 0.91. An analysis of the scores of the three groups of raters employed in the pilot study

yielded an interrater reliability of .94 for the CUNY scale, .90 for Milic, .88 for cohesion, reflecting a great deal of consistency in ratings across raters. The investigator concluded that in this study writing samples can be reliably rated through CWAT, Milic, and Cohesion scorings. Since most researchers accept a reliability coefficient of about 0.80 or above as an indication that the scores provide valid information.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Table 1 presents the data from the first method of analysis. It indicates the frequencies and the percentages for each category ranked according to the most frequently used to the least frequently used category for each language group when they wrote in the narrative mode. Table 2 presents the frequencies and the percentages of usage by Chinese, English and Spanish subjects of the categories of Milic in the expository mode. Table 3 reports the analysis of variances obtained using the data in Tables 1 and 2. A 3 x 2 crossed table provided a two-way analysis of variance.

As can be seen in Table 1, there are numerical differences in the frequencies and percentages of specific categories of sentences produced by each group in the narrative mode. The written language of each group in the narrative mode appeared to be organized structurally in a pattern which produced a recurrent usage of specific Milic Logical Categories.

[Table 1 about here]

Table 2 reports the frequencies and percentages of the sample's use of Milic categories in the expository mode. The findings for the Milic analysis show that Chinese subjects used the initial category most frequently--31%, English used the explanatory--74%, and Spanish the explanatory--56%.

[Table 2 about here]

Comparisons Across Language and Modes--Milic Logical Categories

The emphasis in the present investigation of the organizational structure and written language characteristics of the written English text of native English, Chinese, and Spanish college students warrants several comparative analyses in terms of the subjects' written language samples analyzed with Milic Logical Categories. The comparative analyses were completed across native languages and across the narrative and expository modes for each language group.

When comparing the data results, presented in Tables 1 and 2, two general trends seem to emerge from between the narrative mode and the expository mode of each of the language groups: (a) in terms of the total number of sentences produced within each language group across modes, and (b) the frequencies and percentages of the Milic categories used across modes. The three language groups used more sentences when they wrote in the narrative mode than when they wrote in the expository mode. When these similarities were analyzed, the organizational structure of native language groups were described in a schematic linguistic pattern. Each language group tended to used a

consistent pattern of organization when they produced written language samples in the narrative and expository mode.

In the present investigation, the comparisons between the three language groups, writing in English in the narrative and expository modes, showed no significant differences in the percentages of the usage of the different Milic categories by Chinese, Spanish, and English subjects when they wrote in the two modes. For example, in the narrative and expository modes written by English subjects, 75% of the total sentences written were classified as explanatory. Native Spanish subjects used explanatory sentences 60% of the time in both modes, and additive sentences appeared equally 13% in both modes. Chinese subjects used a similar percentage of initial, additive and causal sentences when they wrote in the narrative and expository modes. The additive and causal modes represented approximately 15% and 5% of the total sentences used in both modes.

The findings of this study reported frequencies and proportions in the use of Milic Logical Categories which produced representative organizational patterns (suggested by Kaplan) of sentences used by native English, Chinese, and Spanish subjects included in this study. Thus, when native English subjects produced written text of a particular topic and in a specific mode, they developed their thoughts and ideas in a sequence of sentence (type) that produced an unbroken linear pattern.

English subjects produced written language in a linear intrasentential pattern. As reported in the Tables, 75% of the sentences used by native English speakers were explanatory. If the

frequency of occurrence of this sentence type of Milic's Logical Categories were plotten graphically, the results would produce a linear pattern (representing 75% of the total sentences produced in the narrative and expository modes) for the native English-speaking subjects.

When native Chinese subjects produced written text about a particular topic and in a specific mode, they developed their thoughts and ideas in a sequence of sentence (type) that produced a pattern as suggested by Kaplan. The present investigator further suggested that the pattern of Chinese subjects' text can be illustrated by an inverted cone, with the beginning of the paragraph occurring at the projected tip (point) of the cone resulting in a centrifugal-nonlinear organizational structure. Chinese subjects appeared to use a greater variety and diversity of sentence types of the Milic categories when compared with English and Spanish subjects. As reported in Tables 1 and 2, native Chinese speakers used four categories of Milic, representing 85% of the total sentences produced. The use of the initial, additive, explanatory, illative, or causal produced a pattern, if plotted graphically, results in a "centrifugal-nonlinear" organizational pattern in the written language product of native Chinese subjects. Chinese subjects used the initial category type sentences most frequently.

When native Spanish subjects produced written text about a particular topic and in a specific mode, they developed their thoughts and ideas in a sequence of sentence types that produced an organizational structure which began initially as a linear pattern,

then "breaks" for a tangential extension of the topic and then proceeds to develop the topic in a linear sequence of sentence that produced the pattern suggested by Kaplan (1966).

Spanish subjects presented a pattern of development and organization, similar to the native English, but made use of the additive category sentence type to produce a "break" or tangential extension of the intersentential sequential pattern exemplified by native English subjects. As presented in Tables 1 and 2, native Spanish speakers used the explanatory sentences 60% and the additive 14% of the total sentences produced. If the frequency of occurrences of these two categories and the adversative were proportioned and plotted graphically, the results would produce a linear pattern (60%) with intermittent use of additive or adversative (18%) which produce a "tangential break" in the linear pattern.

In comparing the results of the statistical analyses of the total number of Milic Logical Categories used in the written English text produced in the narrative mode by native English, Chinese, and Spanish subjects, with the results of the statistical analyses of the number of Milic Logical Categories each group used the expository mode, the following observations can be made:

[Table 3 about here]

Significant differences between the language groups in the category of initial sentences were found (Table 3) in the frequencies of the total for each group as seen in the F ratios of 236.70 and 9.01 computed for the respective analyses. Significant differences were

observed in the use of additive sentences across the three groups' narrative writing as seen in the F ratios of 5.78 and 7.68. No significant difference was observed in the use of adversative as revealed in the obtained F ratios of 0.00 and 1.90. In the comparison of the use of the alternative, significant differences were found in the use of the alternative category across language groups as seen in the F ratios of .07 and 2.82. For each group, the F ratio of 99.80 was significant. In the analysis of the use of explanatory sentences, no significant differences were revealed in the analysis for the explanatory used by Chinese indicating a difference in the comparison within the groups. The significance in the difference between the illustrative categories of 1.84 F ratio, and significance of 23.24 between language groups as seen in the F ratio. Significant differences were observed in the use of illative sentences, F ratio 8.00, but no significance in the F ratio of .44 between modes. There were no significant differences revealed in the use of causal sentences across language groups (F ratio 33.44 and 10.61 for across modes). The writing of the English subjects revealed more explanatory sentences in terms of organizational structure as expressed in the number of explanatory sentences occurring in both modes by native English.

The writing of the native Chinese language group indicated greater density in the use of initial sentences in written language. The diversity of use of the Milic Categories in the writing of the Chinese group was determined by the measure of the number and percentage of different sentence categories they used. The similarity

between the written language of the English and Spanish subjects appeared to be greater than that of the written langugage structure of the Chinese as observed in the similarities and differences between the two groups in the narrative and expository modes. The results of the analysis of the native Spanish subjects revealed significant use of explanatory and additive or adversative sentence types. The analysis of the frequencies and percentages of Milic Logical Categories, which was made for purposes of comparison with the total numbers, yielded results similar to those obtained in the statistical analysis. The written language of the three groups, therefore, represented the organizational structure of the native language in the two modes.

Comparisons Across Language Groups and Modes--Cohesive Devices

The second procedure used to analyze the data employs the concept of cohesion defined by Halliday and Hasan (1976). They outlined five discretely different elements: reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction, and lexical which occur where the interpretation of some element in the (written) discourse is dependent on that of another. The aspects of cohesive devices decribed by Halliday and Hasan were used to contrast the similarities and differences in the frequency of occurrence and types of cohesive devices appearing in written language of Chinese, English and Spanish subjects when they wrote in the narrative and expository modes. Table 4 reports the frequencies and percentages for each category of cohesive devices used in the narrative mode. Table 5 presents the frequencies and percentages of those devices used in the expository mode. In Table 6, the analysis

of variance obtained from the data in Tables 4 and 5 is presented. As noted in Table 4, in the narrative mode Chinese subjects used reference devices--30%--most frequently; English, 46%, and Spanish, 45%, used referent most frequently.

[Table 4 about here]

Table 5 reports the frequencies and percentages of cohesive devices occurring in expository essays written by the Chinese, English and Spanish subjects. As shown in the table, the referent category was most frequently used by English, representing 42% of the total and the most frequently used by Spanish representing 37% of the total. The reference categories (32%) were the most frequently used by Chinese subjects.

[Table 5 about here]

When comparing the percentages of cohesive devices occurring in the narrative and expository modes in written English language samples of Chinese, English, and Spanish subjects, there were significant differences between the total number of cohesive devices used by each group, but no significant differences in the percentages of devices used by each group across modes. Furthermore, the same pattern of usage of cohesive devices by English and Spanish subjects in the narrative mode, also appeared in the expository mode; that is, there

was no significant difference between the frequency of use between each cohesive category across languages.

Moreover, the same pattern of usage of cohesive devices appeared when the Chinese subjects wrote in the narrative and in the expository modes. Differences and similarities occurred when native Chinese subjects were compared with native Spanish and English subjects. The difference between the use of cohesive reference elements in each language in the narrative mode was more significant than in the expository mode, when comparing the differences between the five categories of cohesive elements.

In comparing the results of the statistical analyses of the total number of Cohesive Devices used in the written English text produced in the narrative mode by native English, Chinese, and Spanish subjects with the results of the statistical analyses of the number of Cohesive Devices each group used in the expository mode, the following observations can be made:

[Table 6 about here]

Similarities between the native language groups and their use of referent devices were found in the frequencies of the total for each group across modes, as seen in the F ratio of 62.16, 11.08, 7.58, and no significant differences in the narrative F ratio 1.57 computed for the respected analyses. Significant differences were observed in the use of substitute devices as revealed in the obtained F ratios of 95.44, 4.66, 12.84, and 51.24. In the comparison of the elliptical devices in the written language groups, significant differences were found as seen in the calculated F ratios of 39.76, 67.19, 26.45, and

18.87. For the conjunctive devices the calculated F ratios of 0.83 and 1.72 were not significant at the .05 level of 16.17 and 4.81. Significant differences were noted between the use of lexical devices of the language groups across modes as seen in the in the obtained F ratios of 71.62, 17.94, 22.91, and 45.05 at the .05 level.

There were similarities and differences relevant to the occurrence of cohesive devices in the writing produced by native English, Chinese, and Spanish subjects when they wrote in English in the narrative and expository modes. The frequencies and percentages of the categories of cohesive devices appeared to be related to language background.

When comparing the percentages of cohesive devices occurring in the narrative and expository modes in written English language samples of native Chinese, English, and Spanish subjects, there were significant differences between the total number of cohesive devices used by each group, but no significant differences in the percentage of devices used by each group across modes. Furthermore, the same pattern of usage by English and Spanish subjects, when compared with each other in the narrative mode, also appeared in the expository mode; that is, there was no significant difference between the frequency of use between each cohesive category across languages.

Results of the comparisons were similar between the Chinese use of cohesive devices in narration and exposition and between the differences and similarities occurring when native Chinese subjects were compared with Spanish and English subjects. The referent category was the most frequently used cohesive device in native

Spanish and English, where as the lexical category was the most frequently used device in Chinese.

CONCLUSIONS

The findings reported for this study support the conclusions that the language background of a person influences his/her writing as characterized by (a) organizational structure and (b) the use of cohesive devices in the written language he/she produces in English as a second language when writing in the narrative and expository modes. This confirms Kaplan (1967, 1972) that the patterns of organization, patterns of ordering ideas, and the connections between them which appear in English texts are not necessarily the same which are used by native speakers of other languages, and that even when non-native subjects write in a second language, they employ patterns of organization, style, and linkage characteristic of writing patterns of their native language.

In addition, the findings of this study confirms Halliday and Hasan's (1976) that a particular text or mode may exhibit a tendency to use a certain category and frequency of cohesive devices and Johns (1979); Lieber (1979) that the language background of a subject will determine to some extent the types and frequencies of cohesive elements used in the writing produced by subjects from different language backgrounds.

Furthermore, it is important to note the differences in the number of cohesive devices used by each language in the narrative and expository modes. The researcher suggests several explanations for this occurrence. The difference between the number of devices used by each language group may be attributed to the linguistic factor as

categorized by Halliday and Hasan (1976) of cohesion occurring more in English language syntax than in Chinese or Spanish or it might suggest the need for identifying the elements within Spanish and Chinese which serve as ties, as distinct from those in English. Furthermore, Witte and Faigley (1981) reported that the types and frequencies of cohesive elements seem to reflect the invention skills of student writers. The poor and good writers might use different types of cohesive devices for the differences in the number of cohesive ties reported for each language group.

A second factor that may contribute to the numerical differences in the cohesive elements used by each language group is the total number of sentences written by each native language. The number and types of sentences of different language groups may have produced different syntactic patterns, thus affecting the frequency use of cohesive devices. English subjects wrote 591 sentences in the narrative mode and 435 in the expository mode totalling 1,206 sentences. Chinese subjects wrote 478 sentences in the narrative mode and 341 in the expository mode for a combined total of 849 sentences. Spanish subjects produced 443 sentences in the narrative mode and 334 in the expository mode for a combined total of 777. As presented in Table 4 and 5, there are differences in the frequencies and percentages of cohesive devices used by native English, Chinese, and Spanish subjects.

Native English speakers used a similar organizational pattern when they wrote in the narrative and expository modes as measured by the frequency of use of Milic Logical Categories. Three categories predominate in narrative and expository writing, namely, explanatory,

illustrative, and initial. The written language produced by native English subjects included in this study contain identical frequencies of use of cohesive elements in both the narrative and expository modes. English subjects used referent devices most frequently in both modes. Then they used, in decreasing order, substitution, conjunctive, lexical, and elliptical devices in the two modes.

With one exception (the order in the use of initial and explanatory categories) Chinese subjects produced identical organization structures when they wrote in English in the narrative and expository modes as measured by the Milic Logical Categories. Three of the categories--initial, explanatory, and additive--represented 76% (narrative) and 73% (expository) of the total sentence categories used in the mode.

When the English samples of native Chinese subjects were analyzed using the cohesive devices as a measure, the order and percentage of use of the five categories--referent, conjunctive, lexical, ellipsis, and substitution--were identical for the narrative and expository modes. The referent category was the most frequently used and the substitution category was the least frequently used in English by native Chinese.

There existed a similar organizational pattern in the English compositions of native Spanish subjects when they wrote in the narrative and expository modes. The explanatory and additive categories were the most frequently used in both modes. Three categories--adversative, causal, and alternative--were the least frequently used. In examining the English samples written by native Spanish subjects, the cohesive devices were used in identical order

and percentage as in Spanish in both modes. The referent was most frequently used, followed by substitution, conjunctive, lexical, and ellipsis in the narrative and expository modes.

IMPLICATIONS

The results of this study have led the investigator to several suggestions regarding the teaching of writing to remedial and English as a second language students. First, because proficiency in writing has significant effects on the academic performances of the students, it is apparent that contrastive analysis of syntactic relationships within paragraphs and in different modes of discourse are useful in helping teachers of writing to design more appropriate and effective writing tasks. Based on the findings of several studies (Lieber 1979, Kaplan 1966, 1972) it seems appropriate to recommend that English as a second language and basic writing teachers develop at least minimum knowledge of contrastive analysis and contrastive rhetoric so that they may be able to distinguish the language background of students writing in English in order to plan activities which will help improve students' writing using conventions appearing in the written text of native speakers. Identification and knowledge of the organizational patterns of different languages permit teachers to assist students to learn to write English as a second language more rapidly and accurately. For different native language groups, models for instruction in the various modes of discourse should be designed. It is important that curriculum specialists and teachers develop English as a second language writing curricula for students to include activities and strategies based on comparative rhetoric and comparative writing research.

## REFERENCES

Anderson, P.L., 1980. Cohesion as an index for written and oral composition of ESL learners. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Midwest MLA, Minneapolis.

Britton, J.N., Burgess, T., Martin, N., McLeod, A., & Rosen, H., 1975. The development of writing abilities. London: MacMillan Education Ltd.

Cook-Gumperz, J., & Gumperz, J.J., 1981. From oral to written: The transition to literary. In M.F. Whiteman (Ed.), Variation in writing. Hillsdale, N.J.: Erlbaum.

CUNY, 1978. Fall placement report--1978. New York: Office of Institutional Research, The City College of New York.

CUNY, 1982. Fall placement report--1982. New York: Office of Institutional Research, The City College of New York.

FFORUM, 1979, a newsletter of the English Composition Board. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan.

Halliday, M.A.K., & Hasan, R, 1976. Cohesion in English. London: Longman.

Hayes, J.R., & Flower, L., 1981. A cognitive process theory of writing. College Composition and Communication, 32, 365-387.

Hinds, J., 1982. Contrastive rhetoric--Japanese and English. Unpublished paper presented at TESOL, Hawaii.

Johns, A., 1979. Cohesive error in the written discourse of non-native speakers. Paper presented at the 13th Annual Convention of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Boston.

Kaplan, R.B., 1966. Cultural thought patterns in intercultural education. Language Learning, 14(1-2), 1-20.

Kaplan, R.B., 1967. Contrastive rhetoric and the teaching of composition. TESOL Quarterly, 1(4), 10-16.

Kaplan, R.B., 1977. Comparative rhetoric: Some hypotheses. International (Review of Applied Linguistics), 14, 61-72.

Kaplan, R.B., 1978. On the notion of topic in written expository English. Australian Review of Applied Linguistics, 1(2), 1-9.

Lieber, P., 1979. Cohesion in ESL students' expository writing. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, New York University.

Milic, L.T., 1969. Stylistics on style. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Moffett, J. 1976. A student-centered language arts curriculum, grades K-6: A handbook for teachers. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Mosenthal, P., & Na, T.J., 1981. Classroom competences and children's individual differences in writing. Journal of Educational Psychology, 73(1), 106-121.

National Assessment of Education Progress, 1975. Writing mechanics, 1969-1974: A capsule description of changes in writing mechanics. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Norton, R.F., 1979. A contrastive analysis of Korean and American writing styles as expressed in expository essays. Paper presented at the American Education Research Association, April.

Santana-Seda, O., Sister, 1974. An analysis and contrast in the organization of paragraphs written by university students. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, New York University.

Santiago, R.L., 1970. A contrastive analysis of some rhetorical aspects in the writing in Spanish and English of Spanish-speaking college students in Puerto Rico. Unpublished dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University.

Saville-Troike, M., 1976. Foundations for teaching English as a second language. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Shaughnessy, M.P., 1977. Errors and expectations. New York: Oxford University Press.

Shuy, R.W., 1981. A holistic view of language. Research in the Teaching of English, 15, 101-111.

Smith, F., 1982. Writing and the writer. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Strei, G.J., 1971. A contrastive study of the structure of rhetoric in English and Spanish composition. Unpublished MA thesis, McGill University.

Whorf, B., 1956. Language thought and reality selective writing of Benjamin Lee Whorf. Cambridge: MIT.

Witte, S.P., & Faigley, L., 1981. Coherence, cohesion and writing quality. College Composition and Communications, 32, 189-204.

TABLE 1

Frequencies and Percentages of Sentences of Milic Logical Categories of Chinese-(ESL), English, and Spanish-(ESL) in the Narrative Mode

| CHINESE | | | ENGLISH | | | SPANISH | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Category | f | % | Category | f | % | Category | f | % |
| Explanatory | 154 | 33 | Explanatory | 443 | 74 | Explanatory | 260 | 59 |
| Initial | 139 | 29 | Illustrative | 59 | 10 | Additive | 63 | 14 |
| Additive | 74 | 15 | Initial | 34 | 6 | Illustrative | 39 | 9 |
| Illative | 29 | 6 | Additive | 25 | 4 | Initial | 28 | 6 |
| Causal | 28 | 5 | Illative | 12 | 2 | Illative | 23 | 5 |
| Adversative | 27 | 6 | Causal | 9 | 2 | Adversative | 17 | 4 |
| Illustrative | 24 | 5 | Adversative | 6 | 1 | Causal | 10 | 2 |
| Alternative | 3 | 1 | Alternative | 3 | 1 | Alternative | 3 | 1 |
| Total | 478 | 100% | | 591 | 100% | | 443 | 100% |

TABLE 2

Frequencies and Percentages of Sentences of Milic Logical Categories of Chinese-(ESL), English, and Spanish-(ESL) in the Expository Mode

| CHINESE | | | ENGLISH | | | SPANISH | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Category | f | % | Category | f | % | Category | f | % |
| Initial | 105 | 31 | Explanatory | 326 | 74 | Explanatory | 180 | 56 |
| Explanatory | 90 | 26 | Initial | 30 | 7 | Additive | 43 | 13 |
| Additive | 55 | 16 | Illustrative | 28 | 6 | Initial | 29 | 9 |
| Illative | 34 | 10 | Additive | 24 | 6 | Illative | 17 | 8 |
| Causal | 23 | 7 | Illative | 12 | 3 | Illustrative | 20 | 6 |
| Adversative | 17 | 5 | Adversative | 8 | 2 | Adversative | 17 | 5 |
| Illustrative | 13 | 4 | Alternative | 4 | 1 | Causal | 9 | 2 |
| Alternative | 4 | 1 | Causal | 3 | 1 | Alternative | 3 | 1 |
| Total | 341 | 100% | | 435 | 100% | | 334 | 100% |

TABLE 3

Analysis of Variance of Milic Logical Categories of Chinese-(ESL), English, and Spanish-(ESL) in the Narrative and Expository Modes

| Source of Variation | SS | df | MS | Calculated F |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| (Initial) | | | | |
| Native Languages | 515.335 | 1 | 515.335 | 236.70* |
| Modes | 39.251 | 2 | 19.626 | 9.01* |
| (Additive) | | | | |
| Native Languages | 40.915 | 1 | 40.915 | 5.78* |
| Modes | 108.700 | 2 | 54.330 | 7.68 |
| (Adversative) | | | | |
| Native Languages | 0.000 | 1 | 0.000 | 0.00 |
| Modes | 3.994 | 2 | 1.997 | 1.90 |
| (Alternative) | | | | |
| Native Language | 0.129 | 1 | 0.129 | 0.70* |
| Modes | 1.045 | 2 | 0.522 | 2.82* |
| (Explanatory) | | | | |
| Native Languages | 2352.998 | 1 | 2352.998 | 99.84 |
| Modes | 118.050 | 2 | 59.025 | 2.50 |
| (Illustrative) | | | | |
| Native Languages | 67.179 | 1 | 67.179 | 23.24* |
| Modes | 10.661 | 2 | 5.330 | 1.84 |
| (Illative) | | | | |
| Native Languages | 20.515 | 1 | 20.515 | 8.00* |
| Modes | 2.240 | 2 | 1.120 | 0.44 |
| (Causal) | | | | |
| Native Languages | 48.873 | 1 | 48.873 | 33.44 |
| Modes | 31.019 | 2 | 15.510 | 10.61 |

*Significant at .05 level of probability.

TABLE 4

Frequencies and Percentages of Cohesive Devices of Chinese-(ESL), English, and Spanish-(ESL) in the Narrative Mode

| CHINESE | | | ENGLISH | | | SPANISH | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Category | f | % | Category | f | % | Category | f | % |
| Reference | 243 | 30 | Reference | 780 | 46 | Reference | 539 | 45 |
| Conjunction | 216 | 26 | Substitution | 431 | 25 | Conjunction | 269 | 23 |
| Lexical | 197 | 24 | Conjunction | 403 | 23 | Substitution | 266 | 22 |
| Ellipsis | 120 | 15 | Lexical | 85 | 5 | Lexical | 98 | 8 |
| Substitution | 40 | 5 | Ellipsis | 12 | 1 | Ellipsis | 30 | 2 |
| Total | 820 | 100% | | 1711 | 100% | | 1202 | 100% |

TABLE 5

Frequencies and Percentages of Cohesive Devices of Chinese-(ESL), English, and Spanish-(ESL) in the Expository Mode

| CHINESE | | | ENGLISH | | | SPANISH | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Category | f | % | Category | f | % | Category | f | % |
| Reference | 205 | 32 | Reference | 442 | 42 | Reference | 333 | 37 |
| Conjunction | 186 | 29 | Substitution | 279 | 26 | Substitution | 211 | 28 |
| Lexical | 137 | 22 | Conjunction | 269 | 25 | Conjunction | 207 | 24 |
| Ellipsis | 82 | 13 | Lexical | 65 | 6 | Lexical | 78 | 7 |
| Substitution | 27 | 4 | Ellipsis | 8 | 1 | Ellipsis | 28 | 1 |
| Total | 637 | 100% | | 1063 | 100% | | 859 | 100% |

TABLE 6

Analysis of Variance of Cohesive Elements of Chinese-(ESL), English, and Spanish-(ESL) in the Narrative and Expository Modes

| Source of Variation | SS | df | MS | Calculated F |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| (Reference) | | | | |
| Native Languages | 4076.73 | 1 | 4076.73 | 62.16* |
| | 981.62 | 1 | 981.62 | 11.08* |
| Modes | 205.72 | 2 | 102.86 | 1.57* |
| | 1324.27 | 2 | 662.14 | 7.48* |
| (Substitution) | | | | |
| Native Languages | 2253.55 | 1 | 2253.55 | 95.74* |
| | 117.80 | 1 | 117.80 | 4.66* |
| Modes | 604.51 | 2 | 302.26 | 12.84* |
| | 2590.69 | 2 | 1295.35 | 51.24* |
| (Ellipsis) | | | | |
| Native Languages | 377.12 | 1 | 377.12 | 39.76* |
| | 596.28 | 1 | 596.28 | 67.19* |
| Modes | 501.70 | 2 | 250.85 | 26.45* |
| | 334.92 | 2 | 167.46 | 18.87* |
| (Conjunction) | | | | |
| Native Languages | 468.99 | 1 | 468.99 | 16.17* |
| | 26.20 | 1 | 26.20 | 0.83 |
| Modes | 99.80 | 2 | 49.90 | 1.72 |
| | 319.83 | 2 | 159.91 | 4.81* |
| (Lexical) | | | | |
| Native Languages | 3347.61 | 1 | 3347.61 | 71.62* |
| | 879.12 | 1 | 879.12 | 17.94* |
| Modes | 2141.96 | 2 | 1070.98 | 22.91* |
| | 4415.45 | 2 | 2207.73 | 45.05* |

*Significant at .05 level of probability



BEST COPY AVAILABLE